REMARKS

Claims 1-85 are currently pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue original and other claims in this and any other application.

Claims 1-8, 63-65, and 74-77 stand rejected, claims 9-11, 66-68, and 78-80 stand objected to, and claims 12-61, 69-73, and 81-85 are allowed.

Claims 1-8, 63-65, and 74-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,654,303)("Miyamoto").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a memory refresh circuit comprising "a control circuit for conducting a memory refresh operation, for monitoring a memory device, and for indicating when said refresh operation is complete based on said monitoring of said memory device."

Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest "for monitoring a memory device, and for indicating when said refresh operation is complete based on said monitoring of said memory device." The Office mistaken relies on Miyamoto (at Col. 6, lines 48-65) to support the argument that the Miyamoto's monitoring is the same as the claimed invention. At best, Miyamoto relies on a clock signal, and more specifically, a timeout signal to indicate when a memory refresh operation should be done (not when it is done). Therefore, at best and as indicated by the Office, Miyamoto "measures a period of time for a refresh operation to be completed." (Office Action, page 2) Applicant submits that the Office the incorrectly suggests that the act of the "refresh timer [measuring] a period of time for a refresh operation to be completed" is "considered to be the monitoring of memory device 1 in the corresponding refresh operation." (emphasis in original) (Office Action, page 2). A refresh operation can take a shorter or longer amount of time than that which was pre-allocated and pre-designated by time period for the time out. Miyamoto's FIGs. 2-4 reflect the invention of Miyamoto being reliant on timing signals. FIGs. 2-4 are timing charts showing the operation of Miyamoto and explaining refresh operations...when the timeout signal is output. Miyamoto's reliance and measure of time periods is different from, is not analogous to, the claimed invention's "monitoring a memory device," As such, Miyamoto fails to disclose "monitoring a memory device"

and "indicating when said refresh operation is complete based on said monitoring of said memory device." Therefore, Miyamoto is different from the claimed invention and fails to anticipate the claimed invention for at least that reason. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-8 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim1 and are allowable for at least the reason noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 62 and 74 have a similar limitation as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 63-65 and 75-77 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 62 and 74, respectively, and are allowable for at least the reason noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 9-11, 66-68, and 78-80 stand objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the base claims are allowable, thus claims 9-11, 66-68, and 78-80 are allowable.

Applicant appreciates the indication of claims 12-61, 69-73, and 81-85 being allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No.: 28,371
Michael A. Weinstein
Registration No.: 53,754
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant